

ANNE STEVENSON
*Massachusetts Resident and Voter*¹
email: anne.stevenson@alumni.tufts.edu

June 26, 2012

Dear Ways and Means Committee,

This testimony is with regards to the Ways and Means Committee hearing on **How Welfare and Tax Benefits Can Discourage Work** currently scheduled for **June 27, 2012**.

My main concern is that I would like for Congress to distinguish between and place paramount TANF programs which are means tested and provided to needy women and children below the poverty line, as opposed to the predatory TANF programs bankrupting the country by placing any unfit or unwilling father--even millionaires who abandon their kids--onto the welfare roles.

For your convenience, I have attached a copy of an article I wrote on this issue for the Huffington Post entitled *"Top 5 HHS Programs Endangering Women And Children."* This article can also be found on line at:

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/anne-stevenson/top-5-hhs-programs-endang_b_1511613.html

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 and the Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF) program it created transformed welfare policy by drastically reducing and shifting federal assistance away from the homes of mothers and children and into the homes of violent male offenders. The original intent of welfare reform was to require States to function as collection agencies, recovering financial support from parents who had willfully abandoned their parental responsibilities to their children. These policies have drastically backfired because:

- (a) it dedicated billions in TANF to programs for childless fathers that are not needs based,
- (b) the HHS Office of the Inspector General (OIG)² and the Government Accountability Office³ determined that the programs lacked oversight and are riddled with fraud, and

¹ Contact Information attached but I request it be withheld from the public to protect my safety and privacy.

² "Rollup Review on States' Reporting of Undistributable Child Support Collections as Program Income" HHS OIG report A-05-11-00025, September 30, 2011 (<http://oig.hhs.gov/oas/reports/region5/51100025.asp>)

³ "HEALTHY MARRIAGE AND RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD INITIATIVE: Further Progress Is Needed in Developing a Risk-Based Monitoring Approach to Help HHS Improve Program Oversight" Government Accountability Office Report to the Chairman, Subcommittee on Income

(c) State welfare programs adjusted their environment to have a greater need by casting a wider, less transparent net.

Instead of helping children, welfare reform created a new breed of dangerous Welfare Kings through HHS Office of Child Support Enforcement when it began using non-needs based TANF programs to subsidize the homes and legal battles of the unfit, unwilling, and violent fathers like mass murderer John Muhammad, the Beltway Sniper.⁴

Futhermore, I have also attached for your convenience a copy of the June 2011 letter from OCSE Director Vicky Touresky to Senator John Kerry which declined to provide Senator Kerry with the information he requested, or follow up on his concerns regarding misappropriated funds. Touresky states that OCSE does not have any obligation to oversee OCSE program funding once the checks are cut from the Federal office to the State programs. Instead, Touresky referred Senator Kerry's concerns over OCSE fraud to the HHS OIG, who months before took the position that they lack jurisdiction to investigate a State child support program.

So who is watching the hen house?

I. TANF PROGRAMS FOR MEN ARE NOT NEEDS BASED.

Unlike the welfare programs for women and children which had restrictive income eligibility requirements, TANF diverts billions of dollars through the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) to non-needs based programs exclusively available to unfit and unwilling fathers, such as Healthy Families Initiatives, Responsible Fatherhood Initiatives, and Access and Visitation Initiatives. These program's TANF benefits are not needs based and are available to all fathers-even billionaires.

Benefits from Responsible Fatherhood programs to abusers include:⁵⁶

- Child support obligations are suspended
- Free attorney representation in the family courts to fight for custody
- Free housing
- Direct cash incentives
- Free groceries
- Free car maintenance, gas, and other transportation costs

Security and Family Support, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, September 2008.
<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d081002.pdf>

⁴ "Parental Rights And Wrongs" By Liz Richards, Washington Times,
<http://pmashilohlopez.wordpress.com/2011/07/04/from-the-washington-times-parental-rights-and-wrongs-by-liz-richards/>

⁵ "OCSE Responsible Fatherhood Programs Early Implementation Lessons" Jessica Pearson, Center for Policy Research, Inc. David Price, Policy Studies, Inc. June 2000

With comments: <http://www.nafcj.net/ocsefr.htm>

Original Text: <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED463839.pdf>

⁶ HHS Around the Regions 2005 Activities: <http://fatherhood.hhs.gov/Partners/regions/regions06.shtml>

- Free healthcare and dental care

These TANF benefits are not intended to directly reach children, their purpose is to reward the unfit and unwilling fathers who lost custody of them. The above-referenced HHS reports show that 80% of participants are court ordered into Fatherhood programs, and many are recruited directly from prison. The incentives are structured so that the State will only benefit if children are removed from loving homes, then arbitrarily placed with male offenders who previously lost custody. If the programs do not successfully increase in the percentage of noncustodial fathers who file for and win custody, they will not get paid.

The programs also punish the majority of responsible fathers who willingly provide love and support to their children. Using the virtually unregulated child support system as a vehicle and the father's will to evade prison time as collateral,⁷ the fathers are told they can risk their liberty and property attempting to pay down arrears, or alternatively, sue the mother for custody using a variety of federally funded "supports." Children in safe homes do not need rehabilitation, so often times a "need" is created by the State by placing children deliberately in an unsafe home.

The effect of these Fatherhood and welfare reform policies is to place the middle class on welfare by "leaving no family member undiagnosed" when they come into contact with the family courts.⁸ At the beginning of a custody case, only the offender is sick, but if one violent offender gets custody, the whole family needs treatment. Consequently, it is also not uncommon for courts and social services agencies to appoint dozens of federally funded family court mental health and legal professionals onto the case to sustain the deadly custody rights of a single violent father.⁹

Lastly, the redundant HHS programs that purport to satisfy the "to work" component of welfare reform are already funded via the Department of Labor and the Department of Education. HHS fraud costs tax payers \$60 billion per year, and it is not improving. When you start to look at how many contracts are going to the same network of providers like Manpower, Maximus, Goodwill Industries, etc. with inside connections to HHS Administration, it is also worth asking yourselves if and when Congress will investigate these conflicts of interest?

II. THE GAO DETERMINED THAT OCSE FATHERHOOD PROGRAMS ARE RIDDLED WITH FRAUD.

⁷ "Giving Noncustodial Parents Options: Employment and Child Support Outcomes of the SHARE Program" Irma Perez-Johnson, Jacqueline Kauff, and Alan Hershey, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., October 2003

⁸ "Unified Family Courts: Treating the Whole Family, Not Just the Young Drug Offender" American Bar Association/Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, November 2000
<http://www.rwjf.org/reports/grr/029319s.htm>

⁹ "Pedophilia in the Justice System" By Kieth Harmon Snow, Conscious Being Alliance, May 1, 2012
<http://www.sott.net/articles/show/245202-Pedophilia-in-the-Justice-System>

In 2008, the GAO released a report entitled “HEALTHY MARRIAGE AND RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD INITIATIVE: Further Progress Is Needed in Developing a Risk-Based Monitoring Approach to Help HHS Improve Program Oversight”¹⁰ that concluded that these programs were riddled with fraud and not performing. The GAO concluded that HHS failed to create oversight mechanisms or standard performance goals prior to disbursing \$500 million in grants to hastily chosen programs meant to serve children living in high-risk families:

*“HHS...lacks mechanisms to identify and target grantees that are not in compliance with grant requirements or are not meeting performance goals... Our review of grantee case files found documentation of grantees that were not meeting performance targets...or **not in compliance with grant requirements**, such as providing only those services allowed under the grant.”*

Report Highlights:

\$500 Million Unconditionally Given To Activists: *Operating under a deadline that allowed HHS 7 months to award grants, HHS shortened its existing process to award Healthy Marriage and Responsible Fatherhood grants to public and private organizations. During this process, HHS did not fully examine grantees’ programs as described in their applications, including the activities they planned to offer, and this created challenges and setbacks for grantees later as they implemented their programs.* –P. 2

Failure to Implement Uniform Standards, Policies, and Procedures: *HHS uses methods that include site visits and progress reports to monitor grantees, but it lacks mechanisms to identify and target grantees that are not in compliance with grant requirements or are not meeting performance goals, and it also lacks clear and consistent guidance for performing site monitoring visits.* –P.2

Embezzlement and Fraud Was Likely Vastly Under Estimated: *Moreover, we did not survey organizations that received money from grant recipients to provide direct services, subawardees. Since making the initial awards, 4 organizations have relinquished their grants, 1 organization had its grant terminated, and 1 new grant was awarded. There are 6 organizations currently pending non-continuation of award funds.*

¹⁰ “HEALTHY MARRIAGE AND RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD INITIATIVE: Further Progress Is Needed in Developing a Risk-Based Monitoring Approach to Help HHS Improve Program Oversight” Government Accountability Office Report to the Chairman, Subcommittee on Income Security and Family Support, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, September 2008. <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d081002.pdf>

Please recall that the irresponsible programs are recruiting violent offenders directly from prisons¹¹ to help them obtain legal and physical custody of the child victim witnesses they hurt, yet the GAO cannot directly account for the activities or the funding going into the programs.

Although groups cannot use TANF money for attorneys, the literature shows that some groups like Illinois Council on Fatherhood¹² provides fathers with legal advice and exceptional access to judges, Michigan is providing dads with legal assistance,¹³ and the Montrose County, Colorado Fatherhood program¹⁴ match up fathers with “Fatherhood Coaches” who also just happen to be attorneys who want to help them with their child support and custody problems.

You should ask yourselves who represents the victim child’s interests while their violent noncustodial fathers use concealed child support and federal assistance to build up legal arsenals to take custody and silence them? HHS programs are actually a deadly investment given that (a) abusive men win custody of their victims 70% of the time¹⁵ when they ask for it, and (b) regardless of the gender of the victim, it is a public safety issue when DOJ studies¹⁶ show men perpetrate more than 95% of violent assaults against women. The Center for Disease Control’s 2010 National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey¹⁷ also concluded that men are raped by other men more than 93% of the time, and women are raped by men more than 98% of the time.

Programs like the Massachusetts Department of Probation’s¹⁸ provide “treatment” to thousands of untreatable, incurable violent offenders and sociopaths targeting their victims through the courts. Although violence is a voluntary act, HHS now invested our tax dollars into rehabilitating the incurable who choose to assault the most vulnerable members of society. Some Studies¹⁹ of male DV perpetrators show that 50% of them are sociopaths and another 25% have sociopathic tendencies. Psychopaths are people who feel no emotional connections to others and have zero regard for the rules and regulations of society, they do not respond to therapy, and cannot be rehabilitated. Dr. Robert Hare reports that psychopaths make up 1% of the general population, but 25% of the prison population:

"Violence is not uncommon among offender populations, but psychopaths still manage to stand out," he says. "They commit more than twice as many violent and aggressive acts, both in and out of prison, as do other criminals ... The recidivism

¹¹ National Fatherhood Initiative: <http://www.fatherhood.org/page.aspx?pid=375>

¹² <http://www2.prnewswire.com/cgi-bin/stories.pl?ACCT=104&STORY=/www/story/02-15-2008/0004756780&EDATE>

¹³ <http://www.michigan.gov/dhs/0,1607,7-124--187565--,00.html>

¹⁴ Montrose County, Colorado <http://www.montrosecounty.net/DocumentCenter/Home/View/1721>

¹⁵ <http://www.stopfamilyviolence.org/info/custody-abuse/overview/batterer-manipulation-and-retaliation-denial-and-complicity-in-the-family-courts>

¹⁶ <http://www.umbrellanek.org/documents/DV%20General%20Fact%20Sheet.pdf>

¹⁷ <http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/NISVS/index.html>

¹⁸ <http://www.mass.gov/courts/probation/pr062707.html>

¹⁹ <http://www.lovefraud.com/blog/2010/03/01/staggering-statistics-about-domestic-violence/>

rate of psychopaths is about double that of other offenders ... The violent recidivism rate of psychopaths is about triple that of other offenders."

Respectfully, would you as a member of Congress, allow your child to be cared for by convicted murderers and felons? If you believe these "fathers" are harmless, why do you pass budgets that provide for armed guards to protect Congressional hearings and family courts? These programs have no legitimate purpose because here is no epidemic of "fatherlessness" that in itself harms children.

There is no "fatherlessness crisis" that would justify such ruthlessly irresponsible program spending. We are a nation of strong single mothers who raised Presidents like Bill Clinton and Barack Obama, both of whom were rescued from the clutches of fathers who were irresponsible, violent addicts by their mothers. These Fatherhood programs now undermine and punish mothers who try and rescue their children and stay off public assistance, while punishing good fathers and abetting the irresponsible, no matter how rich or poor.

III. OIG DETERMINED THAT OCSE PROGRAMS ARE RIDDLED WITH FRAUD.

In 2011, the Office of the Inspector General released a report²⁰ called "*Rollup Review on States' Reporting of Undistributable Child Support Collections as Program Income*" that concluded 21 of the 23 States audited failed to properly report program income, and were hoarding tens of millions in child support collections by [intentionally or unintentionally] failing to make sufficient efforts to locate the children the resources are intended to benefit. Only a hand full of counties out of the several hundred contained in the relevant States were audited, and a review of the initial reports shows discrepancies that indicate the problem may be much larger than what the Administration is willing to admit.

The State agency classifies child support as "undistributable arrears" when it collects a child support payment but cannot identify or locate the custodial parent or return the funds to the noncustodial parent. Federal mandate requires that at the time when State law deems the funds "abandoned," States must recognize and report the unallocated funds as program income in order to offset program costs. The Federal policy is that abandoned collections are then split 66% Federal share, 34% are retained by the State. However the OIG determined that all of the states States had [intentionally or unintentionally] devised various "set up to fail" support distribution systems that allow the Agency to improperly hoard the child's money in State coffers by mislabeling it "abandoned property."

Examples of "set up to fail" policies the OIG listed include:

²⁰ "*Rollup Review on States' Reporting of Undistributable Child Support Collections as Program Income*" HHS OIG report A-05-11-00025, September 30, 2011 (<http://oig.hhs.gov/oas/reports/region5/51100025.asp>)

- send checks to the wrong address,
- illegal liens on accounts
- create massive arrears, give dad the tax benefit, then garnish the tax benefit,
- put child support it in trust accounts during litigation-that lasts more than 3 years,
- retroactively abate arrears, then keep it for themselves without telling either parent.

The OIG determined that while some States claimed to be unaware of Federal reporting requirements, *"These deficiencies occurred because States did not have adequate controls to ensure that undistributable child support collections were recognized and reported as program income in accordance with Federal requirements."*

In each instance, the OIG recommended solutions that failed to require State agencies to improve disbursement methods to ensure delivery of the funds to the child's home. Instead, the OIG's focus was to ensure the increased the State's accuracy and compliance with Federal reporting requirements to ensure that the Federal HHS office received its' 66% share of program income.

The audits were done for support collected between 1999-2007, 23 states audited, but only a couple counties within each state were audited---NOT the entire state's child support system. So the fact that like Michigan may have audited 18 counties out of a total of 85 counties, and that those 18 counties stole \$8 million from Michigan families is significant. What would the number be if they did audit the whole state?

But the 2011 roll up report is also incorrect for another reason---it appears to have underestimated the original auditor's findings. The 2011 "roll up" report is a collection of the findings in the original 23 states, most of which were complete by 2009. So I obtained copies of the original audit reports for every state, and found that many states were caught with their hands in the cookie jar for millions and millions of dollars, but the 2011 has them down as owing \$0 sometimes.

(1) Cook County, Illinois: (102 Counties in IL, not sure why it appears only 1 is audited)

2011 Roll Up Total: \$1.8 million

2005 report: \$3.4 Million

<http://oig.hhs.gov/oas/reports/region5/50400039.pdf>

(2) Michigan: (85 counties, only 18 audited?)

2011 Roll Up Total: \$5.3 million

2006 report: \$8 Million

<http://oig.hhs.gov/oas/reports/region5/50500033.pdf>

- (3) **Georgia: (159 counties, none audited, just the state program---so my impression was that the county courts contracted by the State who collected support independently but not through state coffers were never reviewed)**

2011 Roll Up Total: \$238,000

2007 report: \$1.2 million

<http://oig.hhs.gov/oas/reports/region4/40603506.pdf>

- (4) **California: (58 Counties, only 3 audited)**

2011 Roll Up Total: \$1.45m

2007 report: \$3.3 Million

- Orange county: \$2.2 million
<http://oig.hhs.gov/oas/reports/region9/90600040.htm>
- Riverside County: \$245,000
<http://oig.hhs.gov/oas/reports/region9/90700049.htm>
- Los Angeles county: \$878,000
<http://oig.hhs.gov/oas/reports/region9/90800024.asp>

But the LA county report is perhaps inaccurate for another reason, because at the same time the OIG conducted the audit, Attorney Richard Fine sued LA County for holding \$14 million in child support collections from LA county children.²¹ He won the case, and the county had to disburse the \$14 million to the families. But this total is not included in the OIG's report.

IV. TANF CHILD SUPPORT PROGRAMS ADAPT TO ARTIFICIALLY INCREASE NEED FOR THEIR OWN SERVICES

These reports and others reflect the fact that TANF's generous collection incentive policies may have in effect created a child support vacuum as States to adapt their practices to reflect a greater demand and need for resources that are ultimately withheld from needy families. This 2011 report²² found that although the **American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 provided generous matching funds on State support collections:**

²¹ www.articles.latimes.com/1999/feb/20/local/me-9885

²² <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-11-196>

"In fiscal year 2009...child support collections failed to increase nationwide for the first time in the history of the program in fiscal year 2009... Also in fiscal year 2009, the number of CSE cases currently receiving public assistance increased..."

Recovery Act: Thousands of Recovery Act Contract and Grant Recipients Owe Hundreds of Millions in Federal Taxes

<http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-11-686T>

This Government Accountability Office report recently came out which shows that these HHS grant recipients owe us struggling tax paying families hundreds of BILLIONS in taxes.

GAO REPORT: Child Support Enforcement: Better Data and More Information on Undistributed Collections Are Needed

<http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-04-377>

Medicare and Medicaid Fraud, Waste, and Abuse: Effective Implementation of Recent Laws and Agency Actions Could Help Reduce Improper Payments

<http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-11-409T>

Child Support Enforcement: Departures from Long-term Trends in Sources of Collections and Caseloads Reflect Recent Economic Conditions

<http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-11-196>

In fiscal year 2009, the child support enforcement (CSE) program collected about \$26 billion in child support payments from noncustodial parents on behalf of more than 17 million children. The CSE program is run by states and overseen by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). States receive federal performance incentive payments and a federal match on both state CSE funds...The Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (DRA) eliminated this incentive match beginning in 2008, **but the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 temporarily reinstated it for 2 years....**

In fiscal year 2009, the CSE program experienced several departures from past trends. For one, **child support collections failed to increase nationwide for the first time in the history of the program in fiscal year 2009... Also in fiscal year 2009, the number of CSE cases currently receiving public assistance increased ...***Preliminary HHS data show that total CSE expenditures grew by 2.6 percent in fiscal year 2008 as many states increased their own funding to maintain CSE operations when the federal incentive match was eliminated...In contrast to fiscal year 2008, a different picture emerged in fiscal year 2009, when the incentive match was temporarily restored but total CSE expenditures fell slightly by 1.8 percent, which HHS officials told GAO was due to state budget constraints. Most states nationwide have not implemented "family first" policy options...because giving more child support collections to families means states retain less as reimbursement for public assistance costs.*

Administrative Expenditures and Federal Matching Rates of Selected Support Programs

<http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-05-839R>

V. CONCLUSION

The more federal dollars were receive the less States collected in support. States refuse to distribute child support to "families first," and are instead keeping the money for themselves-without accounting for it. When the OIG identified the embezzled funds, they did not help "struggling agencies" find the children it was intended to benefit, the OIG instructed States to properly report...So the feds could have their 66%. This policy entirely lacks accountability or consequences for this fraud. Subsequent reports demonstrated that the problem has continued to worsen, and there are [still] no protocols and procedures in place to define, identify, and track these monies.

The [unlawful] programs are supposed to be ADMINISTRATIVE, but they used quasi judicial power to create, amend, and enforce court orders without judicial authorization. The agency does not provide due process, nor do they have to show you their files. Judges have to look the other way because if they object, they will lose their HHS funding, and at the same time the judge has to accept responsibility for the agency's badly managed and even crooked interference when litigants are hurt.

Instead of fixing these programs, Obama's proposed budget includes billions more in incentives to disburse and collect support to the programs with no oversight. If the core mission of the child support program is to collect and disburse support to needy children, this is an administrative function which in 2012 should be handled electronically through the treasury. There is no need to create billion in incentives to involve the support agency in taking over the judicial branche's functions in custody cases.

Fred Sottile, the Founder and President of the LA chapter of Fathers 4 Justice says in his view:

"The President should spend his efforts creating laws and policies that actually encourage father/child relationships, instead of just pretending to promote father/child relationships in extortion based OCSE programs that deprive children and blame dads for being absent."

Linda Marie Sacks, Co-Chair of the Family Court Committee of the Florida chapter of the National Organization for Women:

"The vast majority of fathers do not abuse children, and there are many instances where courts have unjustly deprived children of good fathers. The problem is that the programs punish children living with healthy strong mothers by incentivizing courts to cash in by arbitrarily minimizing and even eliminating moms from the picture. Since there is virtually no oversight of OCSE funding, we have often found that this funding used to help pedophile rapists and violent predators get custody of child victim witnesses through the family courts. Studies show abusers are winning custody 70% of the time, and we think the programs will have

catastrophic results on the next generation if this unsafe trend of maternal deprivation continues. ”

Liz Richards, Director for the National Alliance for Family Court Justice and a certified witness for the Department of Justice agrees.

“HHS is the source of the funding which is fueling the court corruption problems. Judge are making their rulings according to the program grant requirements and not by the case evidence. Past ACF officials like Wade Horn, Ron Haskins, and others were closely associated with the fathers rights groups and leaders, and essentially turned the dept into a pro-father, abuse cover-up agency.”

I can identify no legitimate purpose for these programs and request that Congress take the following actions:

- (1) Revoke or reduce funding to Administration for Children and Families (ACF) child support incentives, Access and Visitation (AV) programs, and gender based funding to child support agencies.
- (2) End collateral child support/custody funding mandates.
- (3) Overhaul Office on Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) on the federal level to remove staff with conflicts of interest and bias.
- (4) Audit OCSE to find out where our tax dollars are actually going, and then implement rigorous transparency, oversight, and accountability measures on programs.

In 2011, we ask why the Obama Administration inexcusably ignored the pleas of desperate hard working parents and doubled the budget for these pork barrel projects, starving them out of their home. It's time to get serious about deficit reduction, and require the president to exercise fiscal restraint on programs which would target and extort families under the most trying circumstances.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. This declaration was executed in Cambridge, Massachusetts on June 26, 2012.



Anne Stevenson



Too busy
to care for
your PC?

AOL Computer Checkup
will do it automatically.



Try it FREE!

June 26, 2012

HUFF
POST

POLITICS

THE INTERNET NEWSPAPER: NEWS BLOGS VIDEO COMMUNITY

Top 5 HHS Programs Endangering Women and Children

Posted: 05/14/2012 12:15 pm

The so-called "War on Women" is raging, and billions of your tax dollars are being misused to fuel it via the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The solution is to remove the middle class from the welfare roles and do away with gender-based funding incentives.

The [Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996](#) and the [Temporary Aid to Needy Families \(TANF\)](#) program it created transformed welfare policy by drastically reducing and shifting federal assistance away from the homes of mothers and children and into the homes of violent offenders. In an [article](#) entitled "How Federal Welfare Funding Drives Judicial Discretion in Child-Custody Determinations and Domestic Relations Matters" fathers and rights activists Lary Holland and Jason Bottoms explain that this policy has backfired because the incentives are structured so that the state will only benefit if children are removed from loving homes:

"In essence, the federal guidelines wanted the states to function as collection agencies, recovering financial support from parents who had willfully abandoned their parental responsibilities to their children. The result, however, was different from the intent and **has caused the state welfare programs to adjust their environment to have a greater need**, which has caused the program to collect from willing parents that would ordinarily provide a loving environment for their children absent a court order limiting a parent's involvement. Despite the original intent of the IV-D welfare program, it now provides an incentive for the states to use their family courts to produce forcibly absent parents in order to increase the states' IV-D welfare caseload."

These HHS policies created a new breed of dangerous [Welfare Kings](#) through HHS Office of Child Support Enforcement when it began subsidizing the homes and legal battles of the unfit, unwilling, and violent fathers. At the beginning of a custody case, only the offender is sick, but if one violent offender gets custody, the whole family needs treatment. [Consequently, it is also](#)

[not uncommon](#) for dozens of family court mental health and legal professionals onto the case to sustain his deadly custody rights through [HHS programs](#).

The top 5 HHS programs endangering women and children are:

1. **[Child Support Enforcement \(Access and Visitation Programs and Responsible Fatherhood Initiative\)](#)** A [2011 report](#) from the Office of the Inspector General demonstrates that the States are collecting child support, but not disbursing it to the children it is intended to benefit. So where is the money going? Although previous graduates include mass murderer [D.C. Sniper John Muhammad](#), the 2012 HHS budget reflects President Obama's \$1 billion endorsement of the fraud-riddled fatherhood industry.

Using the virtually unregulated child support system as a vehicle and the father's will to [evade prison time](#) as collateral, the fathers are told they can risk their liberty and property attempting to pay down arrears, or alternatively, sue the mother for custody using a variety of federally funded "supports." Unlike the welfare programs for women and children which had restrictive income eligibility requirements, HHS Responsible Fatherhood program benefits are not needs based and are available to all fathers-even billionaires. [Benefits](#) from Responsible Fatherhood programs to abusers [include](#):

- Child support obligations are suspended
- Free attorney representation in the family courts to fight for custody
- Free housing
- Direct cash incentives
- Free groceries
- Free car maintenance, gas, and other transportation costs
- Free healthcare and dental care

While many upstanding fathers honestly complain about TANF programs and the courts victimizing them, the dirty little secret in the fatherhood industry is that the grant recipients who train court personnel, social services, and child support personnel are often [fathers rights groups](#) like the [Fathers and Families Coalition](#), the [Children's Rights Council](#) (Founder [David Levy](#) sits on the board of the [Supervised Visitation Network](#)) and the [National Fatherhood Institute](#).

Clearly, judges understand the danger abusers pose, which is why their courts are guarded with armed deputies and not unarmed social workers. HHS programs are actually a deadly investment given that (a) abusive men [win custody of their victims 70% of the time](#) when they ask for it, and (b) regardless of the gender of the victim, it is a public safety issue when [DOJ studies](#) show men perpetrate more than 95% of violent assaults against women. A [2011 CDC study](#) also shows that men are raped by other men more than 93% of the time, and women

are raped by men more than 98% of the time.

2. [Incarceration/Reentry Programs](#). The purpose of these programs is to recruit violent offenders who are still incarcerated directly from prison, then help them gain custody of victims. It is unclear to me how a child benefits from the dangerous influence of a violent offender insofar as it reduces support to the home they are recovering in. The program paints the offender as the victim and domestic violence as a disease they are afflicted with, curable by the removal of witnesses to their crimes.

Although violence is a voluntary act, HHS now invested our tax dollars into rehabilitating the incurable who choose to assault the most vulnerable members of society. [Studies](#) of male DV perpetrators show that 50% of them are sociopaths and another 25% have sociopathic tendencies. Psychopaths are people who feel no emotional connections to others and have zero regard for the rules and regulations of society, they do not respond to therapy, and cannot be rehabilitated. [Dr. Robert Hare reports](#) that psychopaths make up 1% of the general population, but 25% of the prison population:

"Violence is not uncommon among offender populations, but psychopaths still manage to stand out," he says. "They commit more than twice as many violent and aggressive acts, both in and out of prison, as do other criminals ... The recidivism rate of psychopaths is about double that of other offenders ... The violent recidivism rate of psychopaths is about triple that of other offenders."

Recipients include:

- [Massachusetts Probation Department](#): The Probation Department conducts all pre-trial mediations in the MA family courts. As of 2007, the department claims to have helped 1,600 male offenders with their custody cases, including Springfield inmate [Shawn Suarez](#) who was recruited into the custody switching program from jail, was released, won custody, then was sent back to prison on another violation. In 2011 and 2012, [several](#) high ranking administrators in the Probation Department were indicted by the DOJ and [charged](#) with conspiracy and fraud under the Racketeer, Influence, and Corrupt Organizations Act.
- [Colorado's "Parenting From Prison"](#) received grants to implement programs which recruit violent offenders who are still incarcerated directly from prison, then help them [gain custody](#) of children.
- *CT Child Rapist and mass murderer* [Joshua Komisarjevsky](#)'s nine-year old daughter was brought to visit him 55 times while in prison awaiting trial for murdering and raping 11-year old Michaela Petit, and also killing her sister Haley (age 17,) and their mom. Prior to murdering and raping the Petit family, Komisarjevsky gained sole custody of his daughter, who he promptly handed over to his parents to raise. The same parents who he blamed for his crimes after being found guilty of 17 counts, including the three homicides, and sentenced to death.

3. [Foster care](#). Despite the fact that the National Center for Child Abuse and Neglect found that children are [six times more likely to die](#) in the State's care than those with their parents, it is assumed by some politicians that if you are poor, then you must need the US Department of

Health and Human Services programs to tell you what's best for your own family.

- *In 2012, Colorado Governor John Hicklenhooper* ordered an overhaul of the State's child welfare system after the Denver Post reported [43 children were murdered](#) as a consequence of social workers who dropped the ball.
- *In 2011, San Francisco Department of Child Protective Services* [paid out 4 million](#) to a former foster child who suffered years of abuse after his sister was beaten and starved to death by the foster parent. [Another report](#) showed that more than 1,000 CA foster homes matched the addresses of registered sex offenders, 600 of whom were high risk.
- [This report](#) talks about the 1.5 million mothers who say they were "coerced," "manipulated," and "duped" into handing over their babies for adoption. These women say sometimes their parents forged consent documents, but more often they say these forced adoptions were coordinated by the people their families trusted most... priests, nuns, social workers, nurses or doctors."
- [This report](#) by ABC News reporter Diane Sawyer showed that **25% of all foster kids were on psychotropic drugs**, and the States did not do enough to oversee them.

4. [Center for Faith Based and Neighborhood Partnerships](#). With an annual budget of more than [\\$20 million](#), the Center gives grants directly to religious groups exempt from anti discrimination laws, such as churches and mosques, as well as nonprofits affiliated with them. Often partnered with the above-referenced Fatherhood industry programs, the Partnership's purpose is to "build and support partnerships with faith-based and community organizations in order to better serve individuals, families and communities in need." HHS Secretary Kathleen Sebelius [explains](#) that:

"Faith leaders are trusted partners in local communities. You have a unique ability to reach people, especially the most vulnerable, with the tools and information they need to get healthy, stay well, and thrive."

The consequence of this policy is that unsubsidized secular nonprofits that provide community services such as childcare, education, and healthcare cannot compete with the radical anti-woman nonprofits the Obama administration gives preference to. Examples include:

- [Catholic Charities](#) received **\$650 million** from HHS between 2008-2011, despite the fact that they have lobbied to uphold their discrimination based policies that deny adequate healthcare to women, children, and the LGBT community. This includes policies which refuse women birth control, abortion, and rape counseling to the [more than](#) 10,600 children allegedly raped by some 4,392 priests as of 2002.
- *Atlanta based New Birth Missionary Baptist Church* received [\\$1 million from HHS](#) to support accused pedophile [Bishop Eddie Long's](#) \$3 million salary and benefits package, as well as anti-gay marriage lobbying efforts. In 2012, the SEC announced charges against his successor, Fatherhood promotor [Ephran Taylor](#) who "was actually peddling was a giant Ponzi scheme, one aimed to "swindle over \$11 million, primarily from African-American churchgoers," that reached into churches nationwide, from Long's megachurch in Atlanta to Joel Osteen's Lakewood Church congregation in Houston."

- *"Final Defendant Pleads Guilty to Medicaid Fraud in Scheme Involving Homeless and Pregnant Teenagers "* (3/22/2012). This [press release](#) from the GA Office of the Attorney General regarding God's Promise Center, a business located in Henry County which purported to be a residential treatment program for homeless teenage girls.

Domestic violence is a multibillion dollar industry complete with its own ambiguous gender neutral lingo often causes victims in profitably dangerous homes. The CDC estimated that in 2003 Americans spent \$8.3 billion on the domestic violence industry, which does not take into consideration the nearly [8 million work days](#) per year that victims miss as a direct consequence of being assaulted, nor the costs associated with the children they care for who might also be abused. With as much as [\\$585 billion](#) also spent subsidizing the child abuse industry, so it's no wonder some unethical abuse industry professionals cash in by keeping the public in danger and placing children in dangerous homes.



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W.

Washington, D.C. 20447

JUL 05 2011

The Honorable John Kerry
Member, United States Senate
One Bowdoin Square, 10th Floor
Boston, MA 02114

Dear Senator Kerry:

I am writing in response to your inquiry dated March 18, 2011, on behalf of your constituent, Anne Stevenson, regarding her child support enforcement concerns.

Ms. Stevenson alleges numerous abuses and claims the California Department of Child Support Services, the state courts and other agencies committed fraud.

The Office of Child Support Enforcement does not investigate allegations of fraud against child support enforcement agencies nor does it intervene in court matters. Ms. Stevenson may want to file a formal complaint with the Office of the Inspector General, which is the branch of government that investigates allegations of fraud, misappropriation of funds and other administrative abuses. Ms. Stevenson may contact the Office of the Inspector General at:

Office of Inspector General
Office of Public Affairs
Department of Health and Human Services
330 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Room 5541, Cohen Building
Washington, DC 20201
Phone (202) 619-1343, Fax (202) 260-8512
Email: paffairs@oig.hhs.gov

I hope this information is helpful to you and your constituent. If you need further assistance, please feel free to contact our office again.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Vicki Turetsky", is written over a horizontal line.

Vicki Turetsky
Commissioner
Office of Child Support Enforcement